

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-6, 10 and 12 have been amended to clarify features of the claimed invention and to further distinguish the claimed invention from the references identified in the rejection below.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Deeds, Demsky and Emerson, III. These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 10 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a communication terminal for communicating with a first communication terminal. Claim 1 recites that the communication terminal includes a communication section operable to receive, from the first communication terminal, personal information of the first communication terminal and a presentation attribute that indicates whether a presentation of the personal information of the first communication terminal to a third party is permitted. In addition, claim 1 recites that the communication terminal includes a personal information presentation section operable to present, to the third party, via the communication section, only personal information that has been determined by a personal

information determination section to be permitted to be presented to the third party, the personal information having been acquired from the first communication terminal.

Based on the above-described structure required by claim 1, it is apparent that the communication terminal receives, from a first terminal, personal information (of the first terminal) and a presentation attribute that indicates whether a presentation of the personal information of the first terminal to a third party is permitted, such that a communication section of the communication terminal presents only the personal information (to the third party) that has been determined to be permitted to be presented.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections acknowledge that Deeds fails to disclose or suggest the claimed presentation attribute, determining whether presentation of the personal information to the third party is permitted based on the presentation attribute, and presenting to the third party, only personal information that has been determined to be permitted to be presented, as recited in claim 1. In light of the above the rejections rely on Demsky for teaching the above-mentioned features which are lacking from Deeds. However, in view of the above-mentioned amendments to claim 1, it is submitted that Demsky also fails to disclose or suggest the features of the claimed invention that are admittedly lacking from Deeds.

Rather, Demsky merely teaches, based on content rules, restricting on a terminal-by-terminal basis the viewing of information transmitted from the source of the information (see col. 7, lines 4, 5, 18-23 and 30-35).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Demsky teaches that information is transmitted from a source terminal, which is the source of the information, to another terminal for (possibly restricted) viewing, but fails to disclose or suggest that the first terminal transmits the personal

information and the presentation attribute to the communication terminal and then the communication terminal presents only the personal information to the third party that has been determined to be permitted to be presented, as required by claim 1.

In addition, although Demsky teaches the use of “content rules” which prohibit the transfer of information from the source terminal to the viewing terminal, Demsky still fails to disclose or suggest the “presentation attribute” that indicates whether a presentation from the communication terminal, of the personal information of the first terminal, to a third party is permitted, as recited in claim 1.

In other words, Demsky does not provide a structure that restricts the presentation/transfer of information, from the communication terminal that received the information from the first (source) terminal, to a third party.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 2-9 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Deeds, Demsky and Emerson.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Deeds, Demsky and/or Emerson or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Deeds, Demsky and/or Emerson to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-9 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 10 and 12 are directed to a method and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully

submitted that claims 10 and 12 are allowable over referenced prior art.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuyuki KASHIWABARA

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.08.27 14:12:11 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicant

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 27, 2009